

This is a country, Mr. Speaker, where we have spent almost \$200 billion in the last couple of years. This is a country for which we have done more than any other country has done for another nation in the entire history of the world.

When I led a delegation to Iraq at the end of January, we were proudly told by one general he would have 110,000 Iraqis working for him, or, more accurately, for our taxpayers by July 1, and he controlled only about one-eighth of the population there. Apparently the only Iraqis who have a favorable view of the U.S. are the ones we have working for us.

These people do not appreciate what we have done and are doing for them, and because we have such a huge national debt and such a huge deficit we are borrowing all these billions we are spending there. Some try to say that only a small portion, about \$20 billion, is being spent to rebuild Iraq. This is false, or at least very misleading.

Most of what the military is doing there, building roads, bridges, schools, setting up free health care clinics, fixing airports and telephone and power and water systems, would be called foreign aid in any other country. In fact, our operation in Iraq is the most massive foreign aid program in history.

Saddam Hussein was an evil man, but his total military budget was just two-tenths of 1 percent of ours. He was no real threat to us. Harlan Ullman, a columnist for the Washington Times, who started out favoring this war, wrote a few days ago: "Compared to Hitler and the might of the Third Reich, Saddam was a relatively minor villain. The original reasons for war; namely, weapons of mass destruction and links to al Qaeda, have drifted out of sight."

Anyone who says it is isolationist to oppose this war is resorting to childish name-calling, rather than a mature discussion of the issue on its merits, or lack thereof.

We should be friends with all nations and help out, in fact lead the way, during humanitarian crises, but we should not get involved in every political, ethnic or religious dispute around the world. This just creates more enemies for us and makes terrorism more likely.

We need to follow a foreign policy of enlightened neutrality that relies on war only as a last resort when there is no other reasonable alternative.

At the first of last week, the Chicago Tribune had a story about a young soldier who had just been killed in Iraq. Just a few days earlier he had called his mother and told her, "This is not our war. We should not be here."

When our handover of sovereignty comes on June 30, we should make this a real handover, not just in name only. Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, the main architect of the war, told the Committee on Armed Services a few months ago we would be in Iraq for 10 years.

I hope not.

Some big companies and some military leaders want us to stay there that

long because it means more money for them, but this decision should not be dictated by money. We should declare victory, Mr. Speaker, and begin a phased, orderly withdrawal. We should slowly bring our boys and girls home. We should all hope and pray that no more are killed or maimed for life.

This should not be our war.

Columnist Georgie Ann Geyer wrote recently: "Critics of the war against Iraq have said since the beginning of the conflict that Americans, still strangely complacent about overseas wars being waged by a minority in their name, will inevitably come to a point where they will see they have to have a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empire across the globe."

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing conservative about this war in Iraq. We need to start putting our own people first once again and turn Iraq back over to the Iraqis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RATE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH OR LACK THEREOF IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last night on the floor of this Chamber there were two interesting 1-hour presentations, as many of you remember. One was several colleagues from the Republican side, if I recall from Texas, Illinois, Arizona, my State of Ohio, West Virginia, Florida, Indiana and a couple other States, who spoke about the rapid economic growth we are experiencing; how this is, as the Secretary of Commerce said, quoting now, "It is the best economic climate in my lifetime," he said; that "things were great on the job front; lots of new jobs created, lots of economic prosperity."

Then there also was a group of people, mostly from my State of Ohio, that told stories of letters we have received from constituents, people saying that their college tuition has gone up sharply, 13 percent at Ohio State, for example; they have lost their drug coverage; their programs for education in their communities have been cut, both by local governments and also State governments, and, thirdly, in some cases the Federal Government.

□ 1745

There was major job loss. Companies like Timken in Ohio, for instance, have lost one out of six manufacturing jobs. But what was curious about the difference in the view of the country is

that it is pretty clear my Republican friends kind of all meet in a huddle like a football game and they are all coming out, I do not mean to mix metaphors, but coming out as cheerleaders because they have been sort of instructed by the White House that the only way to win this election is by saying over and over and over and over that this is the best economy we have had in years.

The problem is, and I do not think we are being nay-sayers, I am just passing on, we are all passing on what our constituents in Ohio and Illinois, like the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and others, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) here and others are just passing on what our constituents are telling us, that we need to change the direction of this country.

If the cheerleaders on the other side of the aisle, the President's football squad, if you will, that comes out of the huddle, if they continue to talk about how great the economy is, it means that they are not willing to admit the mistakes of the last 3 years in how our economy and our country are going in the wrong direction.

The only way to correct things is to say, well, maybe we are going in the wrong direction and maybe we need to change course. But the President's answer in every single situation, for every bad piece of economic news the President says two things: we need to cut taxes for the 5 percent wealthiest Americans, maybe some of it will trickle down and create jobs. That clearly has not worked. We have lost 2.7 million jobs since he took office. President Bush will be the first President since President Hoover to have lost jobs during his time in office.

And his other answer is more trade agreements like the North American Free Trade Agreement. He wants us to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement; free trade agreements with Singapore, Chile, Morocco, Australia, the Free Trade Area of America, which will quadruple the number of low-income workers in the NAFTA trade block. He wants us to continue to do that when those policies clearly are shipping American jobs overseas.

Now, those policies, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) said on the floor last night, those policies clearly help the President's political friends, they help his wealthy contributors; but they are not helping workers in this country.

I do not question the motives of my friends on the other side of the aisle, the cheerleading, for saying this economy is in such great shape. I think they really believe it because they spend their time with the 5 or 10 percent of the people in this country who are doing great, the 5 or 10 percent of the people who see profits going up. They are corporate executives, they are big stockholders, they are getting bigger dividends, they see the stock

market going up in some cases, not very regularly, and so they get tax cuts because they are in the upper 1 or 2 or 5 percent income brackets. So the economy is going well for them. But unfortunately, it is simply not going well for so many others in this country.

I am not here to criticize and to throw cold water on their birthday party, but what I am here for is to say let us change direction, because those economic plans and programs have clearly not worked. For 3 years, the President has gotten whatever he wanted from this Congress in terms of tax cuts, in terms of cutting spending on education and health care and veterans benefits, but the economy and the country are worse off than they were 3 years ago.

In my State, we have lost one out of six manufacturing jobs since George Bush took office. Let me explain sort of what happened. There is a company in Ohio called Timken, T-I-M-K-E-N. It is a major employer and has been a good company for northeast Ohio and Canton, Ohio. It is President Bush's favorite company everyone says. The CEO of Timken, fourth generation, very wealthy family, are some of George Bush's biggest contributors and fund-raisers. A year ago President Bush came to Timken and spoke to assembled workers and mostly management and applauded the company because the workers are 10 percent more productive, a year ago 10 percent more productive than they were the year before, and congratulations to them and to that company for that.

But then earlier this year, Timken put out a news release saying that they enjoyed record sales for the first quarter, all-time record sales for Timken, and they said that they had a 60-some percent increase in earnings per share from a year ago. A week later Timken announced, we are building another factory in China and we are closing our three factories in Canton where the corporate headquarters is and laying off 1,300 well-paid Ohioans.

So that is what we are seeing. We are seeing on this side of the aisle, my Republican friends sort of parroting what George Bush is saying, saying this economy is really great; and we are hearing people on this side tell stories, with facts backing it up, about how we need change because these policies are not working. Clearly the policies are working if you are in the upper 5 or 10 percent, because corporate profits are up, dividends are up, tax cuts are being enjoyed by the 1 or 2 or 5 percent wealthiest people.

But in the case of so many others, there are more people that are receiving, going to food pantries, there are more people who are seeing their college educations going through the roof, the increases in college tuition, there are more people who have seen their drug benefits pulled back or scaled down or eliminated; and it is time that we take a different direction.

In this country when you criticize, you need to say, what do you do in place? We should pass the Crane-Rangel bill, which will reward American companies that manufacture here rather than abroad; instead of giving tax cuts abroad, pass unemployment benefits, and pass a better prescription drug bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

RESTORING FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO SPIRITUAL LEADERS OF AMERICA ON POLITICAL AND MORAL ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor tonight because recently we remembered the 60th anniversary of D-Day, World War II. We remembered, we had Memorial weekend, Memorial Day, and then we had the funeral of President Reagan. I think we all remember the price of freedom from those who served in World War II and in all of our wars; and certainly Mr. Reagan led this great Nation as we tried to create freedom for other countries, and he certainly distinguished himself in that way.

I am here tonight to talk about what I consider a real threat to the morality of America, and that is that the spiritual leaders of this great Nation are prohibited from expressing their first amendment rights to speak out on the moral and political issues of the day.

Many people know the history of this. Some do, some do not. The history is that from the beginning of this great Nation, until 1954, a spiritual leader could speak in his church, synagogue, or mosque on any issue of the day and not feel that there would be any retribution from the Internal Revenue Service. Well, one might say, what do you mean the Internal Revenue Service? Well, in 1954, Lyndon Baines Johnson, a United States Senator, offered an amendment on a revenue bill going through the Senate that was never debated. In fact, the Republican majority accepted Senator Johnson's amendment on unanimous

consent, so there were no hearings, no debate, or anything. And basically what Mr. Johnson was trying to do at that time was the H.L. Hunt family in Texas was adamantly opposed to his reelection, and they had a couple of 301 think tanks, and so he wanted to quiet those think tanks. So, therefore, he put an amendment on a revenue bill going through the Senate that was never debated.

The unintended consequences of Mr. Johnson's amendment was and is the fact that churches that are 501(c)(3)s are prohibited from having any type of sermons that might be interpreted as being political at all. I do not know how one can uphold the teachings in the Bible if one does not talk about certain moral issues of the day.

This Nation was built on Judeo-Christian principles; and if this Nation is going to remain strong, then it must remember the Judeo-Christian principles that are the foundation of this great Nation.

The reason I wanted to come to the floor tonight, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the bishop of Colorado Springs issued a pastoral letter to all of the Catholics in his diocese, and I will submit this entire letter for the RECORD.

The reason I bring this tonight to the floor is that the Bishop Sheridan of Colorado Springs has a responsibility to the teachings of Jesus Christ as well as the teachings of the Pope. Being a Catholic leader, he does feel very strongly about the pro-life issue; he does feel very strongly about stem cell research; he does feel strongly about euthanasia, the protection of our elderly. So he issued this pastoral letter reminding the Catholics in his diocese that in this year's election they should look carefully at those running for political office.

Now, he did not mention Democrat or Republican, he did not mention anything of that nature or the name of the candidates. But what he did was to issue this pastoral letter. And then Barry Lynn, who is the leader of the Americans for Separation of Church and State, noted in his letter of complaint to the Internal Revenue Service that Bishop Sheridan used "code words." Code words like pro-choice, pro-life, liberal, conservative, Democrat or Republican.

Mr. Speaker, this bothers me in this great Nation that we would have an agency that because of the Johnson amendment is to enforce the law, but this was not part of the Johnson amendment. There is nothing in the Johnson amendment that talks about code words. That was an administrative decision by the Internal Revenue Service that if you as a religious leader, whether you be Protestant, Catholic, Jew, or Muslim, if you have these types of sermons and you might mention these words like pro-life or pro-choice, then you could have your 501(c)(3) status jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the firm belief that this Nation, I do not believe that